

systems, or trailer parks that have their own water supply system that this is a very important issue when you are considering the safety of their water. Now I guess my feeling is that any time that you introduce legislation to regulate something you automatically make it something that is legitimized. I guess I feel that that is what has taken place now with this practice of chemigation. About five or six years ago the Legislature introduced and passed a bill that required that anybody that uses chemigation should install a check valve on the well to prevent backflow of the chemical and water solution from getting down into the water supply. So that was the start of the state's involvement and responsibility in this area. I guess if I would have been here at that time I would have protested even legitimizing the use of this practice of chemigation which I think is a very serious threat to the water supply of our state. Having had that statute on the books now all these years, we are now in a position where, with about 30,000 pivot irrigators installed in the state, something approaching 20,000 of those now have the chemigation apparatus attached to those. Some have check valves, some don't, some have them in the wrong place. So we have no choice now but to pass LB 284 because it is now going to be, through this way it is going to be the responsibility of the NRDs to have to identify, register, and inspect all of those systems for conformance to the safest way that this practice now can be carried out with proper check valves and automatic shutoffs and so forth. But this still does not satisfy me because in my previous work I had worked for about 15 years as a design engineer and test development engineer on hardware, flow control, liquid control hardware in the aerospace business that pertained to the NASA launch vehicles that were used for the Apollo moon shot. Now in that business we had a requirement that every component had to have a reliability of 99 8/10th percent. Then with all of the components in series you multiply all of those together and you still have to end up with a composite reliability of over 95 percent reliability for operation. Now that was all directed at a one-time operation. Now if I were to be liberal and apply this to just one season's operation, regardless of how many times you start up a system, we have 20,000 systems now out here with this equipment on them and if I would allow a 2/10 percent failure possibility to all this equipment I would still come up with 40 failures over the state. You know these are failures where a check valve wouldn't close and a toxic